R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 060 JC 680 134

REEVALUATION OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM--A PREREQUISITE FOR INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION.

BY- PARK, YOUNG

PUB DATE MAR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.08 50P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, INNOVATION, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, INDIVIDUALIZED CURRICULUM, *COLLEGE ROLE, *TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION,

BECAUSE OF CONDITIONS PREDETERMINED BY TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS AND STATE REQUIREMENTS, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM HAS BEEN RESTRICTED TO A RELATIVELY TRADITIONAL PATTERN. LACK OF SUCCESS OF BOTH TRANSFER AND TERMINAL PROGRAMS, EVIDENCED BY THE NUMBERS OF STUDENTS FAILING TO COMPLETE THEM, INDICATES A NEED TO CHANGE THE CURRICULUM. POTENTIAL AREAS FOR CHANGE ARE (1) TIME, WHICH IS LIMITED BY STATE REGULATIONS WHICH DEFINE CLASS HOURS, TERMS, AND CREDIT HOUR GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS, (2) CONTENT, WHICH IS REGULATED IN PART BY STATE STANDARDS AND WHICH JUNIOR COLLEGE PERSONNEL SEEM RELUCTANT TO ALTER TO ANY SIGNIFICANT DEGREE, AND (3) COMMUNICATION, WHICH IS IN TURN LIMITED BY THE OTHER FACTORS. SUCCESSFUL INNOVATION REQUIRES REEXAMINATION OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AS A UNIQUE INSTITUTION. INNOVATION WILL NOT RADICALLY ALTER INSTRUCTION IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AS LONG AS EXPERIMENTATION AFFECTS ONLY THE DETERMINANTS OF THE CURRICULUM AND NOT THE CURRICULUM ITSELF. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC

ED019060

REEVALUATION OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM: A PREREQUISITE FOR INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 14 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

A Paper

Presented to

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

Graduate School of Education

University of California, Los Angeles

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Education 596

Administration of Higher Education

---

by

Young Park

March, 1968

JC 680134

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS.	1
II.	THE TRADITIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM.	9
III.	INNOVATION AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM . . .	19
IV.	SOME ALTERNATIVES TO THE TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM. .	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY		45

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

The major speaker at the November, 1967, meeting of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program Advisory Council, B. Lamar Johnson, reported that the junior colleges

> . . . are today in a period of history in which traditional plans and methods are inadequate and inefficient for meeting the sharply increasing demands for higher education. New--and many would hold drastically new--methods are crucially required.[1]

This writer agrees with Dr. Johnson that the "traditional system" of instruction in the junior college are inadequate. On the other hand, it is difficult to give unqualified support to instructional "innovations" which have not been devised to alter the "traditional" in college curricula. Many such innovations have been merely added to the existing instructional program without any conscious effort to alter the "traditional plans". It is this general area of junior college curriculum development with which this study is concerned.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. Innovation in the junior college curriculum today is often a matter of: (1) adding new courses;

---

[1]B. Lamar Johnson, Address delivered to the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program Advisory Council, November 27, 1967.

(2) using a mechanical means of communication; (3) continuing the same instructional program under a new title; (4) fragmenting existing programs of study under the guise of meeting "individual needs"; (5) changing physical space. It is not the contention of this paper that such changes are not innovations. The primary premise of this report is that "drastically new" methods are lacking because the basis of instruction, namely the general junior college curriculum has not been altered. Innovations of recent years are not effecting the hard core of instruction because they have been superficially imposed on the traditional curriculum. The following study will concentrate on presenting ideas for reevaluation of the traditional junior college as a means of innovation.

II. DEFINITIONS

Junior College. The conservative nature of lexicographers shows glaringly in Webster's definition, which was probably accurate at the turn of the century.

> junior college, a school giving training in only the first one or two years of the standard college course.[2]

There is little doubt that there have been some changes in the "training" given to junior college students since William Harper coined the term in 1896.[3]

---

[2]Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966), p. 794.

[3]Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1962), p. 18.

To more accurately describe the functions of the modern version of the junior college other names have evolved, such as "community college" or "community junior college". Along with the word college the following ideas and concepts for the junior college have been tenaciously advocated--(1) the junior college is a post-high school institution; (2) the junior college is a two-year institution; (3) the junior college serves the needs of the community; (4) the junior college offers courses commonly taught in the first two years of a college or university; (5) the junior college provides programs in terminal occupational education.[4] For the purposes of this paper the following definition will be used for the term junior college:

> A junior college is a college institution which offers flexible post-high school programs of study for anyone who wishes to pursue higher learning.

Instruction, learning, teaching. In the vernacular this trio of words is "the name of the game". Generally, "to instruct" or "to teach" results in "learning". The word "learning", according to John Dewey, once meant ". . . acquisition of what already is incorporated in books and in the heads of elders."[5]

---

[4]General descriptions of functions and definitions can be found in the following writings: Fields, op. cit.; James W. Thornton, The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966); Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw Hill Company, 1960); The Public Junior College, Fifty-fifth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956).

[5]John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: MacMillian Company, 1954), p. 5.

Dewey would probably more readily accept the modern definitions found in many basic psychology textbooks which describes learning as the process ". . . which brings about a change in the individual's way of responding as a result of contact with aspects of the environment."[6]

"Contacts with aspects of the environment" would be important to Dewey's ideas concerning experiences and learning. Experience is learning to Dewey's way of thinking and advanced learning is a matter of connecting a series of experiences together by a "principle of continuity".[7] One of the major concerns of this paper is the learning environment and while there is no attempt to espouse the philosophy of John Dewey, his explanation of experience and environment furnishes an acceptable definition for use in a discussion of learning and innovation.

> An experience is always what it it because of a transaction taking place between an individual and what, at the time, constitutes his environment, whether the latter consists of persons with whom he is talking about some topic or event, the subject talked about being also a part of the situation; or the toys with which he is playing; the book he is reading . . . or the materials of an experiment he is performing. The environment, in other words, is whatever conditions interact with personal needs, desires, purposes, and capacities to create the experience which is had.[8]

Innovation. Used as a verb, the term to innovate is defined in the dictionary to mean an introduction of new methods, devices or

---

[6]Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967), p. 729.

[7]Dewey, op. cit., Chapter III.

[8]Ibid., pp. 41-42.

to make changes. As a noun, innovation is described as follows:

> . . . 1. the act or process of innovating. 2. something newly introduced; new method, custom, device, etc; change in the way of doing things.[9]

Matthew Miles, writing in Innovation in Education, gives the following definition:

> Innovation is a species of the genus 'change'. Generally speaking, it seems useful to define an innovation as a deliberate, novel, specific change, which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing the goals of a system. From the point of view of this book, it seems helpful to consider innovations as being willed and planned for, rather than as occurring haphazardly.[10]

One of the most important parts of a definition for innovation is found in the last sentence of the paragraph above. Innovations must be planned, executed and evaluated to qualify as an instructional innovation. This thought was supported by junior college educators who met at Palo Alto in February, 1967, under the sponsorship of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program. A significant comment reported from that meeting was, "An experimental college is one that: is organized to change or innovate constantly, has certain defined ends it aims to achieve."[11] The idea of a deliberate action, planned to alter an existing instructional practice, will be used as the meaning of innovation in the remainder of this report.

---

[9] Webster's New World Dictionary, op. cit., p. 753.

[10] Mathew B. Miles, "Educational Innovation: The Nature of the Problem", Innovation in Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 14.

[11] Invitational National Seminar on the Experimental Junior College (Palo Alto: Science Research Associates, Inc., February 23-26, 1967), p. 17.

Curriculum. This word is used frequently by writers in the field of junior college education and it is what should be altered by innovation, but there is a lack of a definition. Some of the following represent varying opinions as what curriculum means.

> . . . Any definition drawn inductively from usage would recognize that what curriculum-makers do is to lay out patterns of teaching-learning offerings designed to be most suitable to the abilities and needs of some group.[12]

The dictionary definition, which seems to represent the traditional meaning, is as follows: ". . . a specific course of study, or collectively, all the courses of study in a school, university, etc."[13] Following Dewey's thoughts, and representing a departure from the definition offered in the dictionary, is one presented by Gordon N. MacKenzie of Columbia University.

> . . . It appeared to be more fruitful, therefore, to define curriculum as the learner's engagements with various aspects of the environment which have been planned under the direction of the school. . . . The word engagement is used to mean what the learner meets face-to-face, what he attends to, or what he is involved in. . . . Obviously there can be engagements with teachers, classmates, or others; with physical factors . . . and with subject matter, ideas, or symbols.[14]

---

[12] Individualizing Instruction, Sixty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962), p. 62.

[13] Webster's New World Dictionary, op. cit., p. 362.

[14] Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Curricular change: participants, power, and processes", Innovation in Education, op. cit., p. 402.

A more familiar definition is offered by Brown and Thornton:

> 'Curriculum' means the entire instructional offering of a college or university. The word is also equated with 'course of study', meaning the pattern of subjects proposed for students who pursue a stated specialization.[15]

Medsker refers to the junior college curriculum as follows:

> The terms 'transfer' and 'terminal' applying to students and curricula, appear frequently in the report. Transfer courses or curricula are those designed for acceptance for credit in senior institutions.[16]

Thornton is more specific about the two curriculums.

> . . . The fundamental principle of junior college transfer curriculums is that they enable the student to know and fulfill the requirements of the college he plans to attend next, so that he may be accepted there as a student in advanced standing and proceed to his objective without loss of time.[17]

Thornton includes a chapter entitled "The Curriculum: Occupational Education" in which he elaborates on the term occupational education.

> . . . Among the phrases essential to an understanding of this aspect of the curriculum are 'terminal education', 'vocational education', semiprofessional education', 'technical education', and 'occupational education'. In addition, some of these are at times used in combination, as 'terminal-technical' or 'vocational-technical'.[18]

An examination of these writings and junior college catalogs seem to indicate that Brown and Thornton's definition is used to

---

[15] James W. Brown and James W. Thornton, College Teaching: Perspectives and Guidelines (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 85.

[16] Medsker, op. cit., p. 6.

[17] Thornton, op. cit., p. 162.

[18] Ibid., p. 176.

designate what is often referred to as the "programs of study". These programs are generally separated into the traditional "transfer" and "vocational", and under each curricula programs of study, or a list of courses, are suggested for the student.[19] Junior college curriculum will be used in this report in two ways:

1. Instructional patterns which are designed to satisfy a particular requirement, such as a vocational skill or transfer to another institution. These are referred to as programs of study.

2. The general instructional environment which involves the contact the student has with the total institution. This is less specific than former statements and involves a philosophic commitment on the part of the college.

---

[19] For examples see Cypress Junior College Catalog, 1967-1968; San Bernardino Valley College Catalog 1965-1967; Los Angeles City College General Catalog, 1966-1967; Pasadena City College Catalog, 1966-1967.

CHAPTER II

THE TRADITIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM

The literature generally divides the traditional junior college programs of study into two categories, transfer and terminal. In California the transfer function of the junior college is given added impetus under the Master Plan of Higher Education.[20]

> The University of California could not have become so selective without the system of state colleges, which admit students with a wider range of ability, and junior colleges, which are essentially unselective. In turn, the state colleges could not make even the proposed modest increase in standards of admission if the junior colleges were not widely available (usually in the same communities). The existence of sixty-nine (this was written in 1962) junior colleges makes it possible for the public four-year institutions to reject a student without denying him an opportunity for higher education.[21]

There does not appear to be any escape from the dominance of the program. As Grace Bird points out

> Preparation for advanced study is commonly called the 'transfer function' of the junior college because it prepares students for transfer with advanced standing to four-year colleges and universities. This is the function which attracts the largest number of regular students to the local community college.[22]

---

[20] A Master Plan For Higher Education in California, 1960-1975 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), Chapter III.

[21] T.R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 11.

[22] Grace V. Bird, "Preparation for Advanced Study", The Public Junior College, op. cit., p. 79.

Although there are greater numbers enrolling in the traditional curriculum leading to transfer, there seems to be a distinct failure on the part of a large majority of students in achieving their goal. Medsker's study revealed that

> In most two-year colleges at least two-thirds of the entering students say they will transfer yet the study of those who entered in 1952 revealed that only one-third of them did transfer.[23]

However, this one aspect of the junior college curriculum has maintained its stronghold on the entering student. The historical development of the junior college, and the traditional pattern of higher education in the United States in general, have contributed heavily to the two-year college being transfer oriented.

Blocker, Plummer and Richardson state that

> The history of American higher education is replete with examples of colleges originally organized for specific purposes and later transformed into more traditional institutions conforming rigidly to the accepted patterns of the university. For example, the land-grant colleges were originally intended to provide instruction in agriculture and mechanics, and did so until the mid-1920's. During the past forty years, however, these colleges have been transformed into universities serving the same educational functions as the public and private institutions founded earlier.[24]

There seems to be a considerable amount of lip service paid to the development of the other half of the junior college curriculum, the vocational, but in the final analysis the transfer program of study

---

[23]Medsker, op. cit., p. 97.

[24]Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer and Richard Richardson, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 15.

seems to win out. McConnell states one of the major reasons for this trend when he writes:

> But in most comprehensive community colleges, the so-called 'terminal' programs seem to wage a difficult and often a losing battle for status in competition with transfer curricula, which carry the prestige of corresponding to 'real' college courses and of preparing students to go on 'to college' in four-year institutions.[25]

It should be pointed out, however, that the terminal program is also traditional in the junior college. McDowell, MacKenzie and Koos spoke of the "community junior college" and its role in preparing students for "middle occupations" before and after 1920.[26] Fields cites several general reasons for the growth in the junior college vocational curriculum. Among these are the depression of the Thirties, World War II, shifts in the occupational pattern and the increasing complexity of modern living. Yet, the enrollment of students in the vocational curriculum at Fullerton Junior College still numbers less than twenty-five percent of the total student body.[27]

A quick reading of most junior college catalogs will give the reader a good indication of how institutionalized the curricula of California's junior colleges are today. The transfer curricula is probably the most uniform because it is generally designed to meet

---

[25] McConnell, op. cit., p. 61.

[26] Fields, op. cit., p. 49.

[27] Fullerton Junior College Statistical Report on Enrollment as of October 2, 1967, Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, California.

in rather exact terms the course requirements of the State Colleges and the University of California. In fact, the programs of study in many catalogs are printed for a specific college or university.[28] This is an understandable and necessary method of designing curriculums because the transfer students must meet entrance requirements of the college to which they hope to transfer. However, if this is the role to be played by the junior colleges then the ideas of innovation in the junior college curriculum is out of the question because it will change only when the state colleges and universities alter their requirements.

If the courses in the programs of study at the junior colleges are to be dictated by the transfer institutions why should there be any differences in the method of teaching in the junior college? If the pattern of the curriculum and the numbering of the courses are identical to those of the four-year institutions, why should entrance requirements differ? The "rationalist" position described by Thornton and keynoted by the statement ". . . the distinguishing mark of the educated person is intellectual power"[29] has been the unconscious guiding light of junior college educators. Junior colleges seemingly want to emulate the four-year colleges by offering

---

[28] Los Angeles City College General Catalog, 1966-67, pp. 112-128. City College of San Francisco General Catalogue, 1966-1967, pp. 171-215.

[29] Thornton, op. cit., p. 5.

identical curricula but at the same time advocate the "open door" and innovations in instruction.

Dr. John Lombardi, speaking before a class of graduate students, once said that a transfer course at the junior college should be the same in content and presentation as the course offered at the university.[30] This author would have to agree that if the transfer curriculum is designed to be the equivalent to the first two years at UCLA then the courses taught should be identical. Furthermore, the textbook, instructor qualifications, hours, units, prerequisites and library facilities should also be duplicated.

It seems somewhat foolhardy to plan innovations which would alter the junior college instructional program when the characteristics of the curriculum is determined by another authority. McConnell points this out quite plainly.

> The University of California must approve all courses which will be submitted for advanced standing from the junior colleges. Thus, the California junior colleges develop their transfer programs with the continuing guidance of the university. Futhermore, the university sends periodic reports of the academic performance of transfer students to the junior colleges from which they came as a means of aiding the latter to evaluate their preparatory work.[31]

The standards and nature of even the vocational curriculum is strongly influenced by external criteria. The Junior College Story,

---

[30] Dr. Fred Kintzer's seminar, Education 441D, Fall Quarter, 1967.

[31] McConnell, op. cit., p. 117.

a publication of the Bureau of Junior College, states the following:

> . . . All graded courses of study, whether vocational or transfer or general education, must be definitely of collegiate level of instruction.[32]

On the one hand, junior colleges become a partner of higher education as they

> . . . take special responsibility for technical curricula, the state colleges for 'occupational' curricula, and the University of California for graduate and professional education and research. The 1955 survey -- the Restudy -- recommended that this division of responsibility be continued.[33]

However, they do not develop their technical curricula free from the standards imposed by colleges and universities. Vocational courses and the suggested curriculum are still tied to the same confining framework of a "collegiate" curriculum for the sake of "transfer" potential or because of prestige.[34]

The following is a definition of Technical Education offered by Norman Harris:

> . . . For the purposes of this Bulletin, however, technical education--
>
> 1. Is organized into two-year curriculums at the college level.
> 2. Emphasizes work in the field of science and mathematics, and frequently, but not always, is related to industry and engineering.
> 3. Gives much attention to technical knowledge and general education, but also stresses practice and skill in the use of tools and instruments.

---

[32] The Junior College Story, Bureau of Junior Colleges (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, August, 1966), p. 11.

[33] McConnell, op. cit., p. 67.

[34] Fields, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

4. Leads to competence in one of the technical occupations, and usually to granting of an associate degree.
5. Includes a core of general education courses (English, humanistic-social studies, liberal arts) up to perhaps one-fourth of the total credit hours.[35]

The instructional environment of the junior college is, in effect, predetermined. Each student is, in theory, counseled into one of two programs and the courses he takes are rather definitely established within the standards set by accreditation teams and universities. It is within this framework that instructional innovations are to occur.

The major objective of the transfer curriculum is not to teach the student subject matter but to have the student successfully matriculate through the proper number of courses, depending on his major and the college to which he wishes to transfer. The major objective of the vocational curriculum is employment.

There seems to be little doubt that the objectives of the transfer curriculum are being achieved FOR THE STUDENTS WHO DO FINALLY TRANSFER. However, this number is still only one third of the total transfer enrollment.[36] This means that about two-thirds of the students in a transfer curriculum do not transfer. Unless there was a change in their individual educational goals the junior college has not been successful in achieving the transfer objective.

---

[35]Norman C. Harris, Technical Education in the Junior College/ New Programs for New Jobs (Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964), p. 21.

[36]Medsker, op. cit., Chapter 4.

If the transfer curriculum is only one third successful how successful is the vocational curriculum? It is interesting to note that Medsker's book devotes a chapter to the "Performance and Retention of Transfer Students" but not one paragraph to the achievement of the vocational students who should be gainfully employed in a skill acquired at the junior college. Moreover, is there evidence that the two-year curriculum espoused in junior colleges will meet the needs of individuals when they seek employment?

The catalog at Fullerton Junior College states that the vocational programs

> . . . have been set up to prepare the student for employment immediately upon graduation from Fullerton Junior College. Except, as noted, four semesters are required for their completion. However, students with deficiencies in mathematics or English skills may need to take remedial courses, which can extend the time spent in the junior college.[37]

Following this statement are a series of vocational programs of study, each listing specific courses to be taken over a two-year period. These plans were designed after careful study and consultation with advisory committees, and yet, national studies seem to indicate that there is ". . . an honest disagreement over what should constitute such a program."[38] Medsker reports that

> It is evident that employers do not agree on what constitutes the best preparation for a job. There is often little unanimity on this subject among industries or companies or even

---

[37] Fullerton Junior College Bulletin, 1967-68, Fullerton, California, p. 78.

[38] Medsker, op. cit., p. 113.

> among personnel at various managerial levels in the same company. . . .

3. About 66% to 80% of the junior college students enroll in a transfer curriculum and about 33% of these transfer to four-year institutions.[42]

4. About 32% of the junior college students fulfill graduation requirements.[43]

The question which can be asked at this point is whether the traditional curriculum in the junior college has been developed with the particular qualities of the students in mind or whether the guiding force has been meeting transfer and occupational goals which have been established upon other criteria.

---

[42] Medsker, op. cit., p. 112. Also see Fullerton Junior College Statistical Report on Enrollment, October 2, 1967.

[43] Medsker, op. cit., p. 95.

CHAPTER III

INNOVATION AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CURRICULUM

In the opening paragraph of this paper reference was made to the new demands of society and the need to alter the traditional curriculum. This would imply that the traditional programs were not meeting the "new demands" because they were created to achieve goals from another era. However, the drop-out rate is still at the fifty percentile level and enrollment in vocational programs is below the twenty-five percentile.

There are several studies and surveys which report on innovation in the junior college instructional program.[44] On the other hand, there are few reports which suggest that the reason there is a need for innovation is because the traditional curriculum has not accomplished its avowed objectives. The innovations that are reported are very often superficial as noted in Ralph Fields' article in The Public Junior College:

> While administrators report many specific examples of ways of initiating new programs and a great number of ways of working to improve existing programs, analysis failed to reveal significant differences in the methods of working on these two aspects of curriculum improvement.[45]

---

[44] B. Lamar Johnson, Islands of Innovation, Occasional Report Number 6 (Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1964).

[45] Ralph Fields, "The Program Defined and Implemented", The Public Junior College, op. cit., p. 170.

While the record may not be as extensive or as impressive as may be desired, there are efforts being made to improve instruction through innovation. However, this paper would suggest that an opportune moment for real change in the junior college curriculum is being lost because (1) there is a distinct reluctance on the part of junior college administrators to admit that the entire junior college structure should be reevaluated because it is not achieving its major objectives and (2) junior colleges are not innovating the basic core of instruction but are, instead, executing the traditional program under a disguise. The question is then, what exactly is being altered?

Dr. Johnson, in his report, Islands of Innovation, summarized his findings under several headings--Recruitment of Faculty; Schedule and Organization of Instruction; Using Community Facilities in Teaching; Accelerating Student Progress; and Cooperation Among Colleges.[46] Miles in Innovations in Education describes innovations as part of a social system, in this case the educational organization with the following components: boundary maintenance operations, size and territoriality, physical facilities, time use, goals, procedures, role definition, normative beliefs and sentiments, structure, socialization methods and linkage with other systems.[47]

---

[46]Johnson, Islands of Innovation, pp. 9-12.

[47]Miles, op. cit., pp. 15-18.

There seems to be some merit to dividing the various aspects of the junior college instructional organization into component parts because this forces one to arrive at a definition of the necessary parts and thus helps to more clearly define the instructional organization. The divisions mentioned above are not necessarily applicable because in the one case an arbitrary kind of division was made on the basis of reports and in the second instance the divisions are meant to apply to education in general.

The California junior college instructional environment is unique. It applies only to the thirteenth and fourteenth grades but has characteristics of both the state secondary system as well as the four-year institutions. All junior colleges are administratively organized for the purpose of facilitating instruction. Within every organizational structure are several major elements, time and space being two. Time is defined quite specifically in the California Education Code.

> CLASS HOUR UNIT - Defined
> 11451.5. For purposes of Sections 11451 and 11451.3, the class hour unit is defined as not less than 50 minutes exclusive of passing time.
>
> The State Board of Education may, by rule and regulation, define partial class hours and prescribe procedures concerning the computation thereof, and make any and all other provision necessary to carry out the provisions of this article.[48]

It is interesting to note that this definition is not found in the section dealing with instruction but in the chapter explaining the formula for computing average daily attendance.

---

[48] Education Code, Volume One, (Sacramento: State of California, Documents Section, 1965), p. 526.

Further definitions of time in instruction is found in the second volume under the heading of "Junior College Courses of Study".

> CREDIT HOUR - Defined; Allowance for Shorter Term
> 25518.5 One credit hour of junior college work is approximately three hours of recitation, study, or laboratory work per week throughout a term of 16 weeks. Where a term is more or less than 16 weeks more or less than one credit hour shall be allowed in the same ratio that the length of the term is to 16 weeks.[49]

Also included in definitions found in the Education Code is the minimum credit hours allowed for graduation from junior college.

> MINIMUM CREDIT HOURS FOR GRADUATION FROM TWO-YEAR COURSE
> 25517.5. The minimum requirement for graduation from a two-year junior college course of study shall be at least 60 credit hours of work.[50]

While there is a rather exact definition of time for instruction in the junior college there is a lack of such guidelines for space. Maximum and minimum numbers in a class are problems with which the college administration must struggle alone. These vary with colleges and with individual administrators. At most colleges the maximum class size is generally determined by the amount of work considered to be "fair" for the instructor. For example, at Fullerton and Cypress Junior Colleges twenty-seven is considered to be the maximum for English 1A. This number includes overloads and other emergency registration factors. The rationale for this number, which is considered to be high by English instructors, stems from the number of papers to be graded. On the other hand, fifty is considered maximum for a lecture class, such as History 7A.

---

[49] Education Code, Volume Two, op. cit., p. 1527.

[50] Idem.

Title 5, California Administrative Code, does give some assistance in planning for new space in the junior college. Article 3, Section 991, states that the "computed space per station in both existing and future classroom, seminar room, and service areas will be 15 square feet per student station."[51]

Time and space are, therefore, organized and administered according to State legislation or self-imposed regulations. One striking deviation is permitted in the Education Code in regard to the semester term which may be converted into three quarters from the two semester school year.[52] The definition of the quarter system is found in Title 5.

> (a) 'Quarter' means a fourth of a school year that includes at least 10 weeks of instruction.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> (e) A 'quarter credit hour' is the credit allowed for approximately three hours of recitation, study, or laboratory work per week for each week in an academic quarter. (An hour is from 50 to 60 minutes.) A 'quarter unit of credit' means the same as a 'quarter credit hour'.[53]

Administration and organization of the instructional environment begins, therefore, with the legal definitions of time and space. Some innovations have been instituted in time and space, as noted by Dr. Johnson's study in innovation. Class size have been altered to

---

[51] Title 5, California Administrative Code (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, June, 1960), p. 222.

[52] Education Code, Volume One, Section 152, p. 39.

[53] Title 5, op. cit., Subchapter 4.4.

include classes of 300 in a lecture and 112 students in a chemistry laboratory[54] to individual study with programmed material and "open laboratory hours".[55] The time factor has been changed in some instances with the year-round calendar and by accelerating high school students but in essence junior colleges still maintain the unit-fifty minute-one credit system.

A third element in the instructional environment is course content, which is closely tied to the fourth factor, communication. Course content is also regulated by the laws of the State.

> . . . A graded course (class) in grade 13 or grade 14 shall possess one or more of the following characteristics:
>
> (1) The course provides credit toward an associate degree; is normally considered of collegiate level; and is approved by the State Board of Education as a component of, a prerequisite to, or eligible as a required or elective course within, a course of study which leads toward an associate degree.
>
> (2) The course is approved by the State Board of Education, and is part of an occupational course of study of beyond high school level within the scope of the term 'vocational and technical fields leading to employment' as the term is used in Education Code Section 22651 which leads toward an associate degree, an occupational certificate, or both.[56]

There does not seem to be many attempts to alter the contents of curriculum but instead much effort has been expended in changing the elements of the instructional environment, or as Gordon N. MacKenzie refers to them, the "determiners of the curriculum".

> . . . Writings about the curriculum, as well as the case descriptions used here, revealed that many attempts at change

---

[54]Johnson, Islands of Innovation, Chapter IV.

[55]Ibid., Chapter VI.

[56]Title 5, op. cit., Section 131.5.

> have focused directly on one or more of the six determiners identified here, treating them as though they were the curricular change. Further, many proposals for change (such as team teaching and educational television) have been advanced on administrative or financial grounds, with no consideration of possible implications for the curriculum.[57]

In general, the innovations described in Islands of Innovation are more concerned with the determiners of curriculum rather than the curriculum itself. However, given the ultimate determiners of the junior college, namely the Education Code, universities and immediate employment, there seems little else that can be done to alter the course content.

The junior college curriculum does not meet the needs of individuals, rather programs are designed to meet the needs of particular groups of individuals. Studies and innovations are more accurately aimed at group instruction primarily because the course content has remained sacred. Fred T. Wilhelms describes the situation with great clarity.

> Probably the most common image of a curriculum is that of a common body of subject matter arranged in a sequence, to be mastered sequentially by everyone who pursues that curriculum. . . . If everybody eventually has to master the same content anyway, then such room as there is for maneuver will be confined almost entirely to adaptations in methodology and administration. . . . Content may be 'watered down' for the less able, so that they take less of what is really desirable at each step. . . . But in the final analysis it will be seen that the effort was to 'commonize' the content as much as possible, rather than to 'individualize' it as much as possible.[58]

A fourth factor in the instructional environment, communication, involves the contact between the student and the instructor. If the traditional curricular pattern is followed the instructor communicates

---

[57]MacKenzie, op. cit., p. 407.

[58]Wilhelms, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

the elementary data, by lecture, readings, demonstration or discussion, and each sequential course becomes progressively complicated. The course outline written for most college courses include aims of the course and their equivalents at certain colleges and universities. In the same manner, suggested programs of study state the aims of the curricular sequence of classes as being the achievement of junior standing at certain colleges and universities.

The objectives of the curriculum or a course is important in the instructional environment because whatever communication transpires between student and instructor is supposedly directed toward the achievement of that objective. Robert Glaser, writing in Theories of Learning and Instruction, states the first step ". . . in designing an instructional system is the specification of its purposes and objectives to be achieved."[59] Dr. Arthur Cohen of UCLA defines objective in instruction as a

> . . . a specific, observable student action or product of student action. To satisfy our definition, it must first, specify something the student is to do, second, state the circumstances under which he will do it, and third, note the degree of accuracy with which he will perform the action.[60]

The "Aims of the Course" set forth for English 60 at Fullerton Junior College are as follows:

> This is a course for students who fall in the bottom third of the national scores on a standard test in English achievement

---

[59]Robert Glaser, "Implications of Training Research for Education", Theories of Learning and Instruction, The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 154.

[60]Arthur M. Cohen, "Defining Instructional Objectives", Unpublished paper, UCLA, 1967, p. 3.

> and who fall in two general categories, those who will take no more college English and those who, though low in achievement, wish to go on through four years of college work. The specific aim of the course, then, is to bring the students to a communication level roughly equivalent to that of the average entering college freshman.

Under a second heading of General Educational aims the following is noted:

> a. To improve the ability of the student to communicate his ideas and understand other ideas.
>
> b. To inculcate habits of industry, consistent application, and steady performance of assigned work.
>
> c. To teach students to analyze their own and others' behavior in an effort to become understanding and sympathetic people.[61]

The catalog descriptions of courses also have statements of objectives although they do not specify these as such. For example, English 1A at El Camino College is listed as being parallel to English 101 at the University of Southern California and English 1 at UCLA.[62] Pasadena City College has its English 1A course as the equivalent to University of California, Los Angeles' English 1A.[63] The point here is that whatever the instructor communicates to his student, as far as English 60 at Fullerton Junior College and English 1A at El Camino College are concerned, must be in some manner conditioned by (1) the standards of the "average entering college freshman" and (2) the standards of UCLA and the University of Southern California.

---

[61]Course outline for English 60 on file in the office of the Division of Education Services, District Education Center, North Orange County Junior College District, Fullerton, California.

[62]El Camino College Bulletin of Information and Catalog of Courses, 1967-68, p. 196.

[63]Pasadena City College Catalog, 1966-1967, p. 247.

This kind of cummunication is taking place at most junior colleges. The communicative process employed at the junior college is rather limited by the other factors of the instructional environment. Time, space (including class size) and course content all set rather definite boundaries, both legal and self imposed, within which instruction must take place. Innovations, therefore, are manifested in mechanical ways. Semesters become quarters, class size is reduced or increased, new courses are added to further elaborate a part of the general curriculum, machines are used to communicate some of the "common body of subject matter", programmed material takes the place of reading assignments, younger students begin the process of "mastering" the sequence of subject matter, lectures become discussion groups and discussion groups become individual study seminars.

If the traditional junior college instructional pattern were translated into a formula it might appear as follows: Instructional Organization (IO) (Time (T) and Space (S)) plus Course Content or Curriculum (C) plus Communication (Co) (Student (St) and Instructor (I)) equals the Instructional Environment (IE). IO (T + S) + C + Co (St + I) = IE. Any one of these elements can be altered and it may effect the instructional environment in a positive or negative fashion. However, the elements themselves have not been evaluated and treated for improvement. Time, communication and other factors have been divided, mechanized, grouped and individualized but the essence of each have remained the same, which means that the junior colleges are still operating a traditional system of education.

In addition to maintaining the same conceptual framework for teaching, the junior colleges, in spite of what is described in the catalogs, are still attempting to achieve the traditional goals in their curriculum. Nothing could be more illustrative of this than the curriculum and organization of "new" junior colleges. There is a sacred core which remains unaltered primarily because new institutions have to meet the traditional criteria for a junior college. Instead of setting new goals and objectives for junior colleges and their students the institutions are attempting to fit students into the traditional mold.

CHAPTER IV

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO THE TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM

In his summary and critique of a meeting of the Wakulla Springs Colloquium on Experimental Colleges, Dr. B. Lamar Johnson made the following point about purposes and curriculum:

> 6. Clearer definition of purposes. Obviously the curriculum of a college - and in particular that of an experimental college - must be based upon a clear definition of purposes. . . . Our nation has a need for varied types of institutions with a diversity of purposes. But there is one type of institution which we do not require. I refer to the college which has failed specifically to define its purposes - or having defined them, fails to design its program to achieve its goals.[64]

This paper has attempted to demonstrate that while there are avowed objectives for the junior college there are unwritten shibboleths which have great influence on the curriculum of the junior colleges. Moreover, certain legal limitations also play an important role in determining the nature of the junior college instructional program. Thus, the objectives and purposes of the institution are under the influences of a variety of forces. Whatever the case may be, if innovations are to alter the instructional program of the junior colleges, the objectives of the colleges will have to be altered. In order to alter the objectives, they will require reevaluation and clearer definition.

---

[64] B. Lamar Johnson, "Behold, You Have Created a New Thing: Summary and Critique", Experimental Colleges (Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964), p. 180.

It would be simple to say that innovation begins with a new set of objectives. However, the "old" set has not been clearly defined or defined to the point that a meaningful and achievable set of objectives can be reached. Part of this seems to stem from the "Unchallenged assumptions" presented by Marjorie Carpenter at the Wakulla Springs Colloquim:

> 1. The first unchallenged assumption is this: the major responsibility of a college is to young people just out of high school. We might ask: is our timing all wrong? . . . Is there an experimental college whose entire plan is free from time limits and age limits?
>
> 2. The second unchallenged assumption is this: we must have grades and total credits for a degree in order to identify the college graduate. . . . if we underline the need for a degree as a mark of the completion of a college education, does this really educate the students?[65]

The junior college as an institution seems to have decided on several "unchallenged assumptions" and most of the objectives have been based on these. The first task before junior college innovators is to make new assumptions and establish new objectives based on those assumptions. It is imperative that a basic part of the foundational framework be that all objectives are to be constantly reviewed and evaluated for possible change every year.

The catalog published by the Fullerton Junior College lists the institutional objectives under the following headings: (1) General Education; (2) Occupational Education; (3) Lower-Division College Education; (4) Special Services (5) Community Service.[66] These are the

---

[65]Marjorie Carpenter, "The Role of Experimental Colleges in American Higher Education", Experimental Colleges, op. cit., p. 8.

[66]Fullerton Junior College Bulletin, 1967-1968, p. 29.

traditional functions of the traditional junior college. They are, with the exception of numbers two and three, unmeasurable in a behavioral sense. Occupational Education and Lower-Division College Education are the only part of this list which can be considered a part of the curriculum. General Education is supposed to be included in all courses.

There does not seem to be much that can be added to this kind of listing which would either be measurable or considered to be innovative. However, a change can be instituted if the objectives of the college were presented under one major heading and given the definition of a "goal" which has been proposed by Dr. Arthur Cohen.

> . . . Let us say first that the term "goal" here indicates generally that which is to become of the students who attend the junior college. It indicates the broad range of their abilities. . . . educational goals indicate actions to be taken, skills to be learned, abilities to be gained, attitudes to be held or modified by the students as a result of their having attended the institution.[67]

If this definition were to be expanded to include the description given by Dr. Johnson in General Education in Action, a single objective for the junior college could be simply "General Education".[68] There are some qualifications of the application of the term general education as used by Dr. Johnson and issue might be taken with the statement

> The importance of general education, here supported and documented by American leaders must in no sense be thought to minimize the necessity for specialized education.[69]

---

[67]Cohen, op. cit., p. 2.

[68]B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

[69]Johnson, General Education in Action, p. 13.

What is the purpose of the junior college? Is it to offer a general education and a specialized education or to neatly divide the curriculum into the five catagories? Thornton presents two contrasting views on these questions -- the "rationalist's" and the "realist's" point of view.[70]

Thornton meant to have the realist's concept of higher education appear as the basis for the junior college. Yet, is it? Is the curriculum in the junior college "useful to society and to individual citizens"? It would seem, contrarily, that the junior colleges have organized themselves as the rationalists had advocated. Thornton writes

> . . . the rationalist sees the college as a comparatively fixed and static institution. The student who is 'college material', in the sense that he thrives on the program of studies set before him, will succeed.[71]

The realist is described by Thornton as one who

> . . . realizes that these common purposes will be achieved in differing degrees by men of differing abilities and that different patterns of educational experiences may well lead men toward the same objectives. He feels that education consists in progress toward a goal rather than solely in the achievement of it.[72]

This seems to be a perfect argument for general education. Yet, the junior college curriculum leads to particular objectives rather than a goal, namely, transfer or immediate employment.

---

[70]Thornton, op. cit., pp. 4-6.

[71]Ibid., p. 4.

[72]Ibid., p. 5.

In contrast to the existing junior college curriculum, and in keeping with the realist's concept, is the education of the "renaissance man". This may have a touch of the rationalist in it and it is meant to have such a connotation. Can junior college education accomplish the "impossible" by combining the liberal education of the rationalist, that is development of intellectual power, and the more practical goals of the realist? This writer feels that such a merger is not only possible but necessary.

Is it necessary to "pass" a sequence of courses, culminating in an advanced degree to "develop occupational skills, neatly divided into two-year skills, four-year skills and the graduate skills? If, for example, the junior college has trained a student in a mechanical skill and he obtains a job which takes forty hours a week of his time, the institution can say it has accomplished its objective. However, what has the institution done for the student in terms of social and civic responsibilities? This student will marry, have children, have the right to vote, and have a direct influence on what mores and customs will be passed on to the next generation.

What has this student "learned"? How has his behavior changed because of the environmental contacts he has had at the junior college? He has learned a skill and will be able to apply this skill, but has his behavior actually changed? This paper would submit that this junior college graduate has been given a static education which is based on a static curriculum. The junior college prepares students for a static world. Secondary education, which includes the junior college,

assumes the world will stand still while they teach the skills which will allow students to function in what is referred to as a changing society.

Instructional innovation must begin with the curriculum. The "art" of teaching will always depend on the quality of the instructor and the same applies to the method of teaching. These innovations are transient actions of an impermanent sort. The curriculum, which involves theory and philosophy, is more basic and a deliberate change in this area is necessary in order to solve instructional problems.

The junior college must be instructionally committed to something more than "training for vocational skills". Jacques Maritain, a philosopher of note, writes the following:

> . . . it is obvious that man's education must be concerned with the social group and prepare him to play his part in it. Shaping man to lead a normal, useful and cooperative life in the community, or guiding the development of the human person in the social sphere, awakening and strengthening both his sense of freedom and his sense of obligation and responsibility, is an essential aim. The ultimate end of education concerns the human person in his personal life and spiritual progress, not in his relationship to the social environment. . . . The essence of education does not consist in adapting a potential citizen to the conditions and interactions of social life, but first in making a man, and by this very fact in preparing a citizen.[73]

How closely does the following statement agree with the above?

> . . . The College looks upon each student as an individual, as a family member, and as a responsible citizen in a democratic society. Therefore it endeavors to help him know himself and his environment, think clearly and objectively, communicate effectively, appreciate the American heritage, develop sound

---

[73] Jacques Maritain, "Man's Nature and the Aims of His Education", W. K. Frankena, ed., Philosophy of Education (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965), p. 41.

> esthetic and cultural values, choose worthwhile goals, and work intelligently as a citizen of his community, state, nation, and the world. Directed to these ends are certain especially planned general education courses, considerable related instruction in every course, and the cocurricular program of the College.[74]

The second statement is taken from the Fullerton Junior College Bulletin, in the institution's description of General Education. Fullerton Junior College, as an institution, can be considered to be based on the so-called "realist" school. Maritain is predominantly in the "rationalist" corner, as evidenced by this statement:

> . . . the pragmatist theory can only subordinate and enslave education to the trends which may develop in collective life and society, for in the last analysis the aims newly arising in such a 'reconstruction of ends' will only be determined by the precarious factors of the environment to be controlled and the values made at each moment predominant by given social conditions or tendencies or by the state.[75]

General education in the junior college curriculum is "slipped" into the transfer or vocational courses and the objectives of general education are theoretically achieved in each course. It seems that general education is an afterthought in the curriculum which satisfies the colleges responsibilities of providing a "college" education for the non-transfer student.

Whatever the genesis of the junior college idea, it is an unique institution today and its purposes and objectives should not be duplication of the other units of education in the Master Plan. The groping for identity, which is often confused with prestige, has caused junior

---

[74] Fullerton Junior College Bulletin, 1967-68, found under Philosophy and Objectives, p. 29.

[75] Maritain, op. cit., p. 42.

colleges to settle into the proverbial "rut". The junior college has created a multitude of limitations which have become dogmas beyond which it cannot venture.

Very frankly the junior college is post-high school education for the masses. As the high school was a radical departure from the idea that education was for the elite, so the junior college can be a departure. The objectives of the high school and the junior college include the idealistic notion that society would be saved by the educated citizenry. Does the junior college contribute to this process? A sober warning is voiced by T. R. McConnell:

> . . . If education for the many does spawn mediocrity, the results may indeed be catastrophic. Unless education challenges the brilliant while serving the ordinary, it will ultimately condemn us to a mean estate.[76]

How does the junior college challenge the brilliant and serve the ordinary? The curriculum has been developed to provide transfer courses for the "brilliant" and occupational courses for the "ordinary". Mediocrity is avoided by maintaining a collegiate title and the introduction of general education courses. There does not seem to be any question that the State Colleges and the universities do not intend to serve the ordinary. The Master Plan recommended that

> 1. In order to raise materially standards for admission to the lower division, the state colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third (33-1/2) and the University from the top one-eighth (12-1/2 per cent) of all graduates of California public high schools . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> 5. The state colleges and the University require a minimum

---

[76]McConnell, op. cit., p. 46.

> of at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate grades in high school. . .[77]

It is therefore, left up to the junior colleges to provide an education beyond high school for the "ordinary". Again, the question is, does the junior college curriculum provide for higher education or does it contribute to "mediocrity"? According to the objectives of the junior colleges they do contribute to uplifting the masses, but the curriculum does not permit the achievement of the objectives. It might well be asked if the heavy concentration on specific vocational skills contributes to the "mediocrity" of junior college education.

The proposal of this paper is to create a new curriculum of general education for the junior college. Within this broad category there are two subdivisions, credit courses and non-credit courses. The reason for this division is to satisfy the demands of the colleges and universities, not to meet the demands of the junior college students. There does not seem to be any good reason that the junior college should not offer any course it sees a need for under either division of general education, for any number of hours, beginning at any time of the year and for anyone who wishes to enroll.

General education should not mean a "watered down" version of everything that is taught for transfer. A better term might be "liberal education". There may be a stronger argument for a vocational general education than for twenty different programs leading to a particular

---

[77] The Master Plan for Higher Education in California, op. cit., p. 4.

skill which might become obsolete in five years or that might prove to be undesirable to the student after being on the job for a year. A general education in a vocational curriculum would attempt to provide a broad background in several general areas, such as machine skills. However, a basic part of this curriculum would be a liberal education which emphasized contemporary life and the problems which exist outside the actual job. This kind of vocational program would allow the student to adapt himself to several different skills as the necessity arose.

A curriculum based on general education, emphasizing basic communicative skills which lead to learning rather than leading to transfer or possible employment, would break the hold that "tradition" has on the junior college. The key to this idea is not to add to the old but to eliminate part of what is obsolete, especially the labels. Junior colleges should force the state colleges and universities to accept the word of the institution that their transfer students are properly prepared for upper division studies. If the junior colleges are blighted by the curse of "prestige" from what are the universities suffering? Is the idea that their traditional curricula is not achieving its objective also a fear? If not, then why cannot the junior college vouch for the "readiness" of its students?

The universities and their traditional approach to education have emphasized the "need" to specialize to the point where "majors" must be chosen by students as early as the ninth grade. The science major does not have time for anything but his major subjects and more often

than not he enrolls in the "easy" one semester history course or takes only the minimum number of units in English. Moreover, he takes these courses because they are required, or because they will be of "use" in graduate school. This is the manner in which students receive their "general education".

The junior college does not teach the values it espouses. Junior colleges "train" students but they do not "teach" or provide "learning". McConnell, in A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education, calls for even more training in higher education.

> The need for technological training in depth might suggest that in the United States we should have two-year programs for technicians, four-year curricula for the bulk of scientists and engineers, and postgraduate programs of varying length for persons with higher aptitudes or interest in research.[78]

However, several paragraphs later McConnell writes

> Our society needs citizens who have had a generous liberal education - citizens whose formal college work has been largely in nonvocational studies. All whose formal education extends beyond the high school need some contact with the world of ideas, the life of the spirit, the world of beauty, the need for civic intelligence.[79]

Very few would argue that the ideas in the last statement should be the goals of higher education but the first paragraph is the basis for education today.

Francis C. Rosencrance of Wayne State University has presented some ideas for a general education program in a four-year institution which might have some significance for the junior college.[80]

---

[78] McConnell, op. cit., p. 51.

[79] Ibid., p. 54.

[80] Francis C. Rosecrance, The American College and Its Teachers (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962), Chapter 4.

These suggestions, and others, are good beginnings for innovations in the curriculum. However, this does not answer the question of why there is a need for innovation.

What is the rationale for change? Is the curriculum of the junior college so perfect that all that is needed is for the instructional determinants to be arranged in a particular pattern? This is a possibility. Each of the elements of the instructional environment could be altered through experiment until the majority of students were trained for transfer or employment. Using the formula mentioned in Chapter III of this paper factors such as time, space, course content, communication could be altered individually or in a combination until the student showed an improvement. This assumes that the curriculum and its objectives are perfect.

On the other hand, the curriculum could be the subject of innovation and new curriculum could be placed into the existing instructional pattern until the objectives were achieved. However, this would require the development of new assumptions about the goals and objectives of the junior college. An indication of what is in store for higher education and what must be considered in making new assumptions about the goals of junior college education can be found in a number of publications. The most up to date account of needs for change in junior colleges is a yet to be published work by B. Lamar Johnson. In this writing Dr. Johnson points out that what is especially needed

> . . . are imaginative plans which are directly relevant to the unique characteristics of the community junior colleges --

> and which draw upon its particular resources and are also addressed to its particular needs.[81]

Is the junior college really unique? If it is unique, why is its curriculum so imitative of the four-year institutions? Can "imaginative plans" be developed when the junior college remains so fearful of being "accepted" by the universities as part of "higher education"?

It is the contention of this paper that instructional innovation will not radically alter instruction in the junior college as long as experimentation effects only the determinants of the curriculum and not the curriculum itself. Junior college instructors and administrators are intimately tied to the pattern of instruction and curriculum espoused by the universities. This traditional pattern of teaching does not have as its base the unique characteristics of the junior college.

Time, space and communication have been altered and the impetus behind these changes has been that the traditional methods are not acceptable for a variety of reasons, one being that students are not transfering in large enough numbers. There is still a question as to whether students are able to obtain employment immediately after completing the vocational program. However, there has not been a strong movement toward changing the basic curriculum.

The most effective argument for a change in the curriculum, in the junior college, is found in Johnson's General Education in Action.

---

[81] B. Lamar Johnson, Islands of Innovation Expanded (Tentative Title), Manuscript being prepared for publication, Chapter III.

In Chapter XII, Dr. Johnson describes some of the applications of general education in Social Studies and writes the following:

> If our schools and colleges were to succeed in achieving all other purposes and then fail in education for citizenship, our educational system would not justify itself before the bar of American public opinion, the taxpayers of our nation.[82]

A description of methods used by California junior colleges in meeting the goals of education for citizenship is followed by one vitally important comment.

> The California state requirement in United States history and government has obviously been established for the purpose of providing citizenship training for junior college students. Despite this, too many of the courses by means of which the state requirement can be met are academically theoretical and fail significantly to affect the citizenship attitudes and practices of students.[83]

The point here is that the course content, or curriculum, is still determined by the pattern set by the universities and individual needs, that Dr. Johnson emphasizes, are not being met.

Fullerton Junior College offers two United States History courses. One is a one semester "survey" course and the second is a two semester "transfer-type" course. However, both are transferable to colleges and universities. Many students majoring in fields other than History or Social Science enroll in the survey course rather than burdening themselves with another semester. Is the two semester course more complete in "providing citizenship training" than the one semester course? And what of the transfer student who has completed only one

---

[82] Johnson, General Education in Action, p. 256.

[83] Ibid., p. 259.

semester? Is he only partially prepared to undertake upper division studies?

Some of the colleges, such as Bakersfield College, have devised non-transfer courses to meet this requirement. The instruction given in these non-transfer courses should be different because the basis for developing the different courses are different. It is not for transfer hence the objectives are not the same.[84] This course, called Social Science 53a-53b, seems to be a wholesome approach to citizenship and general education but transfer students (who make up two-thirds of the entire student body in junior colleges) are not enrolled in this course. They still take two semesters of the traditional United States History.

It seems that Bakersfield College has gone part of the way. They have altered the course content, but the traditional attitude toward the junior college curriculum seems to have kept the college from a more basic innovation in the curriculum. In the last chapter of General Education in Action, Dr. Johnson makes the following recommendation:

> 7. Include in plans for continued, state-wide work on general education the development of a minimum program of general education courses to be recommended for California junior college students.[85]

This statement could be expanded to read "the development of a total program of general education to be used as a basis of junior college

---

[84] Bakersfield College Catalogue, 1965-1967, p. 149.

[85] Johnson, General Education in Action, p. 393.

education." The change in the curriculum will, in the opinion of this writer, bring a change in instructional objectives and this would result in innovative teaching methods. Dr. Johnson opens the second chapter in his new book with the following statement:

> It is axiomatic that change in society must be reflected in education. Current discussions of, and reports on innovation in education might make it appear that our schools and colleges are keeping pace with developments in society. And yet, it is clear that many classrooms are unaffected by the many drastically new ideas and procedures in education which have been developed and are being advocated. . . . .[86]

It is the contention of this paper that changes in the classroom will not occur until the basic curriculum has been changed. The definition presented in Chapter I of this paper of junior college curriculum included the terms instructional patterns and instructional environment. In the traditional curriculum the patterns and environment were designed with transfer and employment in mind. In the new curriculum they must be designed to meet the problems of about ninety percent of the population who will attend the junior colleges at some point in their lives. Along with this, instructional patterns must be based on the philosophic commitment of the junior college and this commitment must be created out of new assumptions and new objectives.

---

[86]Johnson, Islands of Innovation Expanded, Chapter II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

Bakersfield College Catalogue, 1965-1967.

Bird, Grace V. "Preparation for Advanced Study", The Public Junior College. The Fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Brown, James W. and James W. Thornton. College Teaching: Perspectives and Guidelines. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1963.

Bureau of Junior College. The Junior College Story. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, August, 1966.

Carpenter, Marjorie. "The Role of Experimental Colleges in American Higher Education", Experimental Colleges. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

City College of San Francisco General Catalogue, 1966-1967.

Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1960.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Defining Instructional Objectives". Unpublished paper, University of California, Los Angeles, 1967.

Cypress Junior College Catalog, 1967-1968.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: The MacMillian Company, 1954.

Education Code. Volumes One and Two. Sacramento: State of California, Documents Section, 1965.

El Camino College Bulletin of Information and Catalog of Courses, 1967-1968.

Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1962.

Fields, Ralph. "The Program Defined and Implemented", The Public Junior College. Fifty-fifth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, 1956, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Fullerton Junior College Statistical Report on Enrollment, October 2, 1967.

Glaser, Robert. "Implications of Training Research for Education", Theories of Learning and Instruction. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1964.

Harris, Norman C. Technical Education in the Junior College/New Programs for New Jobs. Washington D.C. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

Invitational National Seminar on the Experimental Junior College. Palo Alto: Science Research Associates, Inc., February 23-26, 1967.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "Behold, You Have Created a New Thing: Summary and Critique", Experimental Colleges. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

_____. General Education in Action. Washington D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1957.

_____. Islands of Innovation. Occasional Report Number 6. Los Angeles: University of California, 1964.

Los Angeles City College General Catalog, 1966-1967.

MacKenzie, Gordon N. "Curricular Change: Participants, Power, and Processes", Innovation in Education. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1964.

Maritain, Jacques. "Man's Nature and the Aims of His Education", Philosophy of Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1962.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1960.

Miles, Matthew. "Educational Innovation: The Nature of the Problem", Innovation in Education. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1964.

Pasadena City College Catalog, 1966-1967.

Rosecrance, Francis C. The American College and Its Teachers. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962.

Ruch, Floyd L. Psychology and Life. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.

San Bernardino Valley College Catalog, 1965-1967.

Title 5. California Administrative Code. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, June, 1960.

Thornton, James W. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

Wilhelms, Fred T. "The Curriculum and Individual Differences", Individualizing Instruction. Sixty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962.